



Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

Global Spectroscopic Survey of Cloud Thermodynamic Phase 2005-2015

David R. Thompson, david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Brian Kahn

Robert O. Green

Steve A. Chien

Daniel Tran

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology

Elizabeth Middleton

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center

© 2017. All rights reserved. US Government Support Acknowledged.

Why study cloud thermodynamic phase?

- Important for Earth's climate and planetary radiation budget (Chylek 15 et al., 2006; Martins et al., 2011; Ehrlich et al., 2008; Tan and Storelvmo, 2016).
- Clouds are shifting poleward in the Northern and Southern Hemisphere extratropical storm tracks (Bender et al., 2012; Marvel et al., 2015; Norris et al., 2016).
- Climate model experiments with forcing from increased CO₂ have shown losses of cloud ice phase and gains of cloud liquid phase (Ceppi and Hartmann, 20 2015; McCoy et al., 2015).
- Spatial partitioning of ice and liquid particles within clouds can change Global Climate Model (GCM) predictions of future warming by over 1 degree Celsius (Tan et al., 2016).
- Traditional observations only resolve phase at 1km or coarser.




6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Spectroscopic cloud phase retrieval

[Thompson et al., JGR-Atmospheres 2016]




6/2/2020


david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Simulation performance

Multiband



Spectroscopic




6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Hyperion Archive, 2005-2015

> 48,000 scenes




6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Example Cloud Phase Maps

Blue and green color channels indicate liquid and ice optical path lengths.
30 meter spatial sampling. Full acquisitions are 256x3918 pixels.




6/2/2020


david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Spectrum fits from example image

Mixed phase cloud



Ice cloud



Typical fits are better than our (conservative) noise estimate





6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Latitude Trends: Liquid

Error bars are 95% confidence intervals via nonparametric bootstrap.
AIRS estimates use 0.1 cloud fraction threshold







6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Latitude Trends: Ice

Error bars are 95% confidence intervals via nonparametric bootstrap.
AIRS estimates use 0.1 cloud fraction threshold




6/2/2020


david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Comparison vs. Hirakata et al. 2014


Hyperion 2005-2015




Hirakata et al. (Sep-Nov)



Sep, Oct, Nov



Ice







6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Intermediate phases


(Liquid Thickness Fraction)



6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

Variogram Spatial Scale Analysis



6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

12

Conclusions

1. First global high spatial resolution survey of cloud thermodynamic phase.
2. Spatial correlations follow a power law.
3. Approximately 50% measurable variance is determined at length scales of 6km.
4. Significant spatial variability appears at scales far below the resolution of typical GCMs.
5. Noise-equivalent measurement error of 7.5-11% in the liquid thickness fraction for different latitudinal zones



6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

13

Addenda

- Caveat: Measurements are spatially biased, favor land over ocean.
- Continuous monitoring in the future is a new potential application for global mapping spectrometers
- Onboard analysis could enable continuous “always on” mapping



6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov

14

Thanks!

- The Hyperion team
- NASA Earth Science
- Calwater-2 flight planning incl. Ian McCubbin, AirMSPI and DOE Airborne ARM facility for assistance with original validation (Thompson et al., JGR 2016)



6/2/2020

david.r.thompson@jpl.nasa.gov